

Remarks

Claims 1-23 are pending.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,598,557 to Doner et al. (“Doner”). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Doner. Claims 5, 7, 12 and 13 are rejected as being obvious over Doner in view of U.S. Patent 6,338,050 to Conklin et al. (“Conklin”). Claims 10 and 17 are rejected as being obvious over Doner in view of U.S. Patent 5,297,039 to Kanaegami et al. (“Kanaegami”). Claim 14 is rejected as being obvious over Doner in view of U.S. Patent 6,016,504 to Arnold et al. (“Arnold”). Reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks below is respectfully requested.


The Doner reference does not show a connection between keywords and products nor products available for purchase as claimed. In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner points to Figs. 3 and 5 of Doner as showing products and then simply states that these products are available for purchase. However, the “products” shown in Figs. 3 and 5 are merely folder names for a document available for searching in Doner. There is no indication that such products are available for purchase as claimed. Additionally, there is no indication in Doner of a connection between keywords of a reference document and products to be displayed to a user. In Doner, keywords of an initial document simply produce more documents with related keywords – not products. See, e.g., Doner, column 6, lines 24 – 40. Even if the reference document in Doner is labeled “products”, there is no indication that this folder relates to products available for purchase and certainly no indication that this reference

document is analyzed to yield products – as claimed in all of independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 21.

Therefore, it is asserted that independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 21 are patentable over Doner. The references to Kanaegami and Arnold are not cited for, and do not appear to include, the above referenced limitations. As such, it is asserted that claims 1, 11, 18 and 21 are patentable over these claims as well. Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-20 and 22-23 include the above referenced limitations of independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 21, respectively, and include additional recitations which, when combined with the limitations of claims 1, 11, 18 and 21 are also neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. It is asserted that these claims are patentable as well. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks above.

It is asserted that the present Communication places the application in condition for allowance or in a better form for appeal. Entry is earnestly solicited.


Respectfully submitted,



Steven S. Rubin
Reg. No. 43,063
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER
& STEINER LLP
900 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 895-2000

Dated: March 8, 2004

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited this date with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mailing, Label No.: EV 330373256 US addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450


Steven S. Rubin, Reg. No. 43,063

3/8/04
Date